



STATE OF TENNESSEE
Department of Education

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS # 33111-03819
AMENDMENT # 2
FOR Administration/Delivery, Scoring, and Reporting
of State Assessments

DATE: MARCH 29, 2019

RFP # 33111-03819 IS AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

1. This RFP Schedule of Events updates and confirms scheduled RFP dates. Any event, time, or date containing revised or new text is highlighted.

| EVENT | TIME (Central Time zone) | DATE | Completed/Revised |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. RFP Issued | | March 5, 2019 | Completed |
| 2. Disability Accommodation Request Deadline | 2:00 p.m. | March 8, 2019 | Completed |
| 3. Pre-response Conference | 10 a.m. | March 14, 2019 | Completed |
| 4. Notice of Intent to Respond Deadline | 2:00 p.m. | March 15, 2019 | Completed |
| 5. Written "Questions & Comments" Deadline | 2:00 p.m. | March 20, 2019 | Completed |
| 6. State Released QTI Sample Package | | March 21, 2019 | Completed |
| 7. State Response to Written "Questions & Comments" | | March 29, 2019 | Completed |
| 8. Response Deadline | 2:00 p.m. | April 11, 2019 | |
| 9. State Schedules Respondent Oral Presentation | | April 18, 2019 | |
| 10. Respondent Oral Presentation | 8 a.m. - 4:30 p.m. | April 22, through April 26, 2019 | |
| 11. State Completion of Technical Response Evaluations | | April 30, 2019 | |
| 12. State Opening & Scoring of Cost Proposals | 2:00 p.m. | May 6, 2019 | |
| 13. Negotiations | | May 13, 2019 | |
| 14. State Notice of Intent to Award Released and RFP Files Opened for Public Inspection | 2:00 p.m. | May 30, 2019 | |
| 15. End of Open File Period | | June 6, 2019 | |
| 16. State sends contract to Contractor for signature | | June 10, 2019 | |
| 17. Contractor Signature Deadline | 2:00 p.m. | June 13, 2019 | |

2. State responses to questions and comments in the table below amend and clarify this RFP.

Any restatement of RFP text in the Question/Comment column shall NOT be construed as a change in the actual wording of the RFP document.

| RFP SECTION N and PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| A.7 | <p>1</p> <p>The State will provide all Respondents non-secure “check sets” that include QTI 2.1 packages to render the various item types required on the TCAP Assessments. The Respondent must demonstrate that it can import the State’s check sets that include QTI 2.1 packages and render the TN test content as designed without error or unacceptable variance in its computer-based test delivery system. Evidence of the complete and successful ingestion must be provided by the response deadline.</p> <p>When and how will these “check sets” be made available to bidders? Could they please be posted as soon as possible?</p> | <p>Amendment 1 posted the QTI documents to the State’s public portal on March 21, 2019.</p> |
| C.13 | <p>2</p> <p>Provide access to a fully-functional demo site, along with documentation, for the Respondent’s computer-based testing (CBT) delivery system as outlined in Pro Forma Contract Section A.9. The State will provide non-secure “check sets” that include QTI 2.1 packages to render the various item types required on the TCAP Assessments. The Respondent must demonstrate that it can import the State’s check sets and render the TN test content in its CBT delivery system.</p> <p>When and how will these “check sets” be made available to bidders? Could they please be posted as soon as possible?</p> | <p>Amendment 1 posted the QTI documents to the State’s public portal on March 21, 2019.</p> |
| | <p>3</p> <p>Just wanted to see if you had an update on when the “check set” items will be released. The DOE staff mentioned that they had them and might release them today.</p> | <p>Amendment 1 posted the QTI documents to the State’s public portal on March 21, 2019.</p> |
| | <p>4</p> <p>Do you know if the QTI Package for the State Assessments RFP will be posted or sent out to vendors today? We’ve not received it yet and I do not see it online.</p> | <p>Amendment 1 posted the QTI documents to the State’s public portal on March 21, 2019.</p> |

| RFP SECTION N and PAGE # | | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|--|----|--|---|
| Pg 2. & Pro Forma Contract §A.3 | 5 | <p>Please clearly define the scope of the RFP. Particularly, there appears to be differing information regarding the optional grade 2 in ELA and Mathematics in the RFP (examples of this difference in scope are RFP pg. 2 and Section A.3 of the Pro Forma contract).</p> <p>Please confirm Grade 2 is a part of this RFP and describe the proposed Grade 2 assessment under the new contract.</p> | The Optional Grade 2 ELA and Mathematics assessments are part of the RFP and are described in section A.3.a (4)-(5), A.3.c, and Attachment A (TCAP Assessment Program Context). |
| Pro Forma Contract §A.4 | 6 | The RFP states that a contract will be signed by June 13, 2019. Please confirm the first test administration under this contract is fall 2019 EOC testing, deliverables for this administration are due as early as July 2019. | Yes the first test administration under this contract is fall 2019 EOC. The due dates for the deliverables are outlined in the Pro Forma Contract. |
| C.15 | 7 | What is the state's responsibility to determine if a district or school is prepared (ready) for online testing? | The state has a readiness certification program, Ready for TNReady, through which districts verify device readiness, secure browser download, and student opportunities to participate in the practice test. The district is responsible for completing all requirements outlined in the Ready for TNReady checklist in order be ready for testing. The state provides support to districts in completing this readiness program and publishes the results for each district. |
| C.14 | 8 | Do the districts make device purchases independent of state guidelines for testing? Software purchases? | Yes, districts make local purchasing decisions to secure their own devices and software. |
| General | 9 | What is the annual amount of the current administration contract? | Approximately \$26 million annually |
| Pro Forma Contract §A.4(c)(1) | 10 | Does the current administration contract require vendor program staff to reside in TN? | The current contract does not specify this. |

| RFP SECTION N and PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|--|--|--|
| Introduction §1.1.2 | 11 How was the \$20 million budget determined? | This is an estimate based on current costs and expectations to transition to more computer based testing and artificial intelligence (AI) scoring. It also reflects the cost savings measures included in the RFP, and the shift of some work streams (i.e. test development and design) to another state vendor. |
| Pro Forma Contract §A.3(c) | 12 Can you please clarify the scope of the full PBT back-up requested by the State. Particularly, the grades and content areas—does the PBT backup cover grades 5-8/ELA, Math, social Studies. Or, does it cover all grades and content areas with CBT assessments— grades 5-8/ELA, Math, social Studies; grades 5-8 science; and all End-of-course Exams? | The scope covers all grades and content areas with CBT assessments, including End of Course exams. |
| Pro Forma Contract §A.3(c), Cost Proposal Workbook, Cost Options Workbook | 13 The State requests a full PBT back-up option each Testing Year during the Term if requested by the State. However, there is no location to include pricing for this option in the Cost Options Workbook. Where would the State like to see pricing for this cost option? | Paper-back up option will be ordered at the same line item pricing respondent provides in the cost workbook and we will adjust the quantity according to need. |
| Pro Forma Contract §D.32. | 14 Some insurance levels required by the state, including the \$20M liability insurance, may only be able to be reasonably obtained by the very largest of vendors. As this requirement has the possibility to eliminate a large number of vendors from this bid, and possibly to only one possible respondent, is the State willing to consider different levels of required insurance? | The insurance levels included in the RFP were recommended by the Central Procurement Office's Risk Manager. The TDOE's goal is for this RFP to be as competitive as possible for all vendors and is willing to consider vendor requests in negotiating the final contract in order to not preclude an otherwise qualified vendor. The Respondents are permitted to submit, as part of their Response, a "redline" of RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma Contract</i> , that tracks |

| RFP SECTION N and PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|--|---|--|
| | | the Respondents' request for alternative or supplemental contract language. The redline changes that are allowed by this provision shall not include any exceptions or changes that (1) contradict any applicable state or federal law; (2) a mandatory requirement identified in RFP Attachment 6.2. – Section A; or (3) alter any deadlines in the Schedule of Events. |
| Pro Forma Contract §A.7(g) (1) | 15 What are the potential research questions that TDOE anticipates would be associated with the requirement for computer-based delivery system interface comparability studies? | “What differences, if any, exist in the test scores for students participating in the state assessment on different devices, after controlling for prior test scores (and possibly other characteristics)?” |
| Pro Forma Contract §A.7(g) (1) | 16 What types of information and/or guidance would TDOE expect to gather from this study? | TDOE would expect to potentially refine recommendations for allowable assessment devices, or provide additional information to districts on differences in student performance, which could help inform district purchasing policies. The study would also be submitted as part of the US Department of Education peer review requirement. |
| | 17 With respect to ownership of Intellectual property, does the State agree that rights in any pre-existing proprietary materials and computer programs/software previously developed by the Contractor, as well as rights to any derivative works, shall belong to the Contractor? If this is not correct, please explain. | Yes, the State will honor any preexisting intellectual property rights of the Contractor. All work products developed or produced by the Contractor under this Contract shall constitute “works made for hire” or have similar status under relevant intellectual property law. The State shall have full, final, and perpetual ownership rights to all work products or other content and materials provided by the Contractor for the State under this Contract. At no cost to the State, the Contractor shall obtain and provide any necessary intellectual property licenses or permissions to use |

| RFP SECTION N and PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | existing materials and shall assign and transfer to the State all intellectual property rights in all work product(s) developed, produced or delivered under this Contract. |
| | 18 Offeror wishes to clarify that any references to "Subcontract/s" or "Subcontractor/s" in the RFP refers to agreements entered into by Contractor with another entity specifically in connection with a prime contract entered into by the Contractor and the State pursuant to this RFP and does not refer to agreements between Contractor and vendors providing products or services to Contractor generally in the course of their business. Is this correct? | Correct. The TDOE considers a subcontractor to be another entity that the prime contractor engages with to fulfill a term of the contract. |
| | 19 Contractor assumes that the questions and answers will be incorporated into and become part of the final contract with the State. If this is not correct, please explain. | No, the State's responses to respondent questions during the question and answer phase are part of the RFP process but will not be incorporation into the final contract. Responses are for clarification purposes as respondents develop their responses. |
| A.2 | 20 "The State has separately contracted with ETS for development of all test forms, including Item development and related activities for the 2019-2020 school year. The Test Development Contractor will provide the Contractor with print-ready forms for PBT and QTI packages containing test forms for CBT. The Test Development Contractor will also provide all necessary Scoring keys, rubrics, and Scoring guides for test takers." What expectations should vendors have with respect to Test Development after 2019-2020? Should vendors expect that print-ready forms, Scoring keys, etc. will be provided each year of the contract or should vendors plan to be responsible for | Vendors should expect that the test development role will maintain consistent after 2019-20 (all forms will be print-ready, etc.). |

| RFP SECTION N and PAGE # | | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|--|----|--|--|
| | | these tasks starting in contract year 2? | |
| A.3.c, A.9.13 | 21 | Can the State verify that the requirement, "The Contractor shall provide a full PBT back-up option each Testing Year during the Term if requested by the State" can be met through Print on Demand functionality as stated in section A.9.13 | Contingency plans must be pre-approved by the State, but may include the ability to print materials on demand. |
| A.3.c | 22 | <p>Can the State provide further definition around the requirement noted on Page 10 of this section.....(2) trial runs for PBT logistics to confirm its shipping logistics and accuracy. This shall include a fall and early spring shipment to each Assessment location for every potential student."</p> <p>For vendors to adequately prepare for this, can the State provide detail on the purpose and goals of this activity. I.e. Are there specific items that are required to be sent; Are the materials LEA specific, school or student specific; Are signatures of receipt required; What type of reporting is required to demonstrate the accuracy?</p> <p>In order to drive efficiency into the program, would the State consider making this a first year only requirement so long as quality processes are demonstrated successfully in the first year?</p> | <p>The State will require one practice shipment prior to operational testing in order to confirm readiness.</p> <p>The purpose is to have the vendor complete two real-world mock runs of the PBT requirements in the contract to confirm readiness. The vendor shall complete a fall and an early spring shipment to every school for every potential tester to test shipping logistics and accuracy. The requirements for the trial run mirror the PBT requirements for performance of PBT testing.</p> <p>Yes, the State is willing to consider making this a first year only requirement but may require it in future years depending on vendor demonstration of success during the contract term.</p> |
| 4.8. Disclosure of Response Contents | 23 | <p>"All materials submitted to the State in response to this RFP shall become the property of the State of Tennessee. Selection or rejection of a response does not affect this right. By submitting a response, a Respondent acknowledges and accepts that the full response contents and associated documents will become open to public inspection in accordance with the laws of the State of Tennessee."</p> <p>If a Respondent wishes to submit confidential information in their proposal</p> | Respondents should clearly mark any items it deems as confidential. The State will consider items so marked as confidential to the extent allowable under law. |

| RFP SECTION N and PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>response, and does not want it to become public, will the State allow a Respondent to designate certain information as confidential so that it will not be disclosed?</p> | |
| A.4.j. | <p>24 The table for subsection j. Various Meetings states that there should be “10 attendees per test” for the standard setting meeting. Traditionally, in our experience with Tennessee, and similar state programs, committees include two or three grades in one committee room (e.g., grades 3 and 4 science in one committee).</p> <p>Please confirm that the State would accept a range of 15 to 20 attendees per committee room to allow for sufficient diversity among the panelists with respect to teaching experience, geography, and demographics and for the increased reliability of the overall process.</p> | <p>The vendor should provide costs for 10 attendees per test, and can include 15-20 attendees in their technical response with pricing in the cost proposal sheet using the “Other” rows.</p> |
| <p>TCAP Assessment Form Specification Table - Grades 2-8 (Spring Administration only);</p> <p>Alternative (Spring Administration Only)</p> | <p>25 There are asterisks for the Social Studies administration tables that state the following:</p> <p>“Social Studies Grades 3-5 provided in case the grade levels are reinstated during the Contract.”</p> <p>Please confirm that these grades (3-5) for Social Studies and Social Studies alt and all costs related to their administration, including the 2021 Standard Setting activities, are part of the base bid and that, if the State does not reinstate those tests, this will be addressed with a reduction in scope from the initial contract.</p> | <p>This understanding is correct – if the assessments are not reinstated in the future, cost items related to these assessments would not be ordered by the state or performed or billed by the vendor.</p> |
| A.12 | <p>26 On page 21, the Spring Comprehensive Data File (CDF) is required by June 1. Attachment 6.6.A has the following dates:</p> | <p>Yes, TDOE confirms Attachment 6.6.A should be used for planning and costing</p> |

| RFP SECTION N and PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>Raw Score Report: May 14 Comprehensive Data File: May 25</p> <p>Can the State confirm that the dates provided in Attachment 6.6.A should be used for planning and costing purposes?</p> | purposes. |
| <p>Attach ment 6.6, p. 42, item f.; p. 51, Section A.14; p. 72, Section E.14; and Attach ment B, pp. 80- 83</p> | <p>27 Does the State agree that the awarded contractor can negotiate the amount of liquidated damages/score card damages payable under the term of the Contract by proposing a reasonable cap to the cumulative total of damages payable by the Contractor under either the full term of the contract or on an annual basis?</p> | <p>The RFP allows respondents to suggest redline edits to the pro forma. The State is under no obligation to accept any suggested redline edits. A respondent's suggested redline edits are the starting point for any terms and conditions negotiations. The risk of the State's acceptance or non-acceptance of a respondent's proposed redline edits is on the respondent. If the State is unable to reach a contract with the highest evaluated respondent, the State reserves the right to attempt a successful contract negotiation with the next highest evaluated respondent and so on.</p> |
| <p>Attach ment 6.6, Section D.20</p> | <p>28 Contractor assumes that the State will not be providing any Protected Health Information under a contract resulting from this RFP. If that is correct, our assumption is that this clause does not apply to this contract. If not correct, please explain.</p> | <p>Correct.</p> |
| <p>Attach ment 6.6, Section D.24.</p> | <p>29 With regards to the Force Majeure Clause, we presume the Contractor will not be held responsible for delay or default to the extent caused by the State or third parties contracted by the State. Is this correct? If this is not correct, please explain.</p> | <p>Section D. 24 of the pro forma contract describes the events giving rise to a force majeure. A force majeure event excuses a party's performance until the end of the force majeure event. The actions of the State or a third party contractor of the State would only constitute an event of force majeure to the extent it constitutes one of the events described in Section D. 24. of the pro forma contract.</p> |
| <p>Attachm ent 6.6, Section D.24</p> | <p>30 We presume that in the case of a force majeure event, the State and the Contractor will negotiate the impact of the event and any applicable schedule changes necessitated by</p> | <p>Yes, In the interests of amicably resolving contract disputes, it is anticipated that a</p> |

| RFP SECTION N and PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|
| | the event. If this is not correct, please explain. | force majeure event would necessitate an evaluation by the parties of any needed schedule changes, relief from requirements, and so on. |
| Attachm ent 6.6, Section D.32 | 31 We believe we have sufficient insurance coverage that may not match exactly with the insurance requirements detailed in the RFP. Will the Contractor who is awarded any resulting contract have the opportunity to discuss exact insurance requirements with the State upon award? | The insurance levels included in the RFP were recommended by the central procurement office's risk manager. The TDOE's goal is for this RFP to be as competitive as possible for all vendors and is willing to consider proposed redline edits to the contract in order to not preclude an otherwise qualified vendor. However, acceptance of proposed redlines remains at the sole discretion of the TDOE. |
| Attach ment 6.6, Section E.4. | 32 We assume that the Contractor's obligation to indemnify the State under this provision applies only to any intellectual property in the form provided by the Contractor and as unmodified by the State? | E.4. applies to goods or services provided by the Contractor pursuant to the Contract, not to otherwise non-infringing goods or services that only become infringing due to modification -by the State. |
| Attach ment 6.6, Section E.5 | 33 In providing the requisite services to the State under this RFP, the Contractor plans to use its own proprietary software and systems that the State will access as part of the services that the Contractor provides to the State. Contractor does not anticipate licensing these systems to the State. Is the State amenable to this model? If not, please explain. | The State is open to this vendor model as long as all users are able to access the system in a royalty-free manner, without any additional ULA, and in accordance with the requirements of the contract. |
| Attach ment 6.6, Section E.8(d) | 34 Can the State please provide more information about what events may be included in this requirement? Will the State work with the Contractor to determine longer RTO's if needed for certain events? If not, please explain. | The TDOE is willing to consider the severity of the event in determining the RTO. |
| Attach ment A | 35 The chart indicates 74,000 students for grade 2 ELA and Math. RFP section | For pricing purposes, the vendor should plan for all grade |

| RFP SECTION N and PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|
| - TCAP Assessment Administration Context | A.3.a.(4), page 9, notes these assessments are optional. Are contractors to assume all grade 2 students sit for these exams or should there be a different student count anticipated? | 2 students to sit for these exams. |
| Attachment A - TCAP Assessment Forms Specifications | <p>36 Math grade 3 shows 8 field test items and 50 operational items. The Grades 3-5 Math Assessment Overview indicates the following item types: Multiple choice, Multiple select, Fill in the blank, Graphing, and Matching table.</p> <p>Can the State clarify the number of items by type to be administered at each grade and content for both field test and operational? Will this information apply to all contract years?</p> <p>For ELA, can the State provide detail regarding how new writing prompts will be field tested and the annual volume of field testing that will occur. Including the number of unique writing field test items.</p> | See attached table, "Item Types for TN Assessments, 2018-19". The administration vendor could expect this information to be similar (though there may be some minor changes) across future years. |
| Attachment A - TCAP Assessment Forms Specifications | <p>37</p> <p>The provided Attachment A - TCAP Assessment Form Specifications does not include grade 5 ELA. Can the table be updated with this information?</p> | See attached updated table labeled TCAP Assessment Forms Specifications table. |
| Attachment A - TCAP Assessment Forms Specifications | <p>38</p> <p>Are the items/prompts on the Fall EOC new and unique or are they reused from prior administrations?</p> | Both. Items on the fall EOC will consist of new items, as well as reused items. |
| Page 20 (A.7) and Page 29 (C.13) | <p>39 With regard to the following from page 20 (A.7) and page 29 (C.13):</p> <p>The State will provide all Respondents non-secure "check sets" that include QTI 2.1 packages to render the various item types required on the TCAP Assessments. The Respondent must demonstrate that it can</p> | Amendment 1 posted the QTI documents to the State's public portal on March 21, 2019. |

| RFP SECTION N and PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>import the State's check sets that include QTI 2.1 packages and render the TN test content as designed without error or unacceptable variance in its computer-based test delivery system. Evidence of the complete and successful ingestion must be provided by the response deadline.</p> <p>Provide access to a fully-functional demo site, along with documentation, for the Respondent's computer-based testing (CBT) delivery system as outlined in Pro Forma Contract Section A.9. The State will provide non-secure "check sets" that include QTI 2.1 packages to render the various item types required on the TCAP Assessments. The Respondent must demonstrate that it can import the State's check sets and render the TN test content in its CBT delivery system.</p> <p>When and how will these "check sets" be made available to bidders? Could they please be posted as soon as possible?</p> | |
| Pro Forma Contract , Section B, pg. 55 | <p>40</p> <p>Please confirm the contract start date and duration of the initial contract prior to the three renewal options.</p> | <p>Anticipated initial term is July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2021.</p> |
| RFP Attachm ent 6.2, part C.7 | <p>41</p> <p>Please confirm that C.7 of the proposal response template corresponds with the requirements of section A.4.i (Technical Support Services) of the Pro Forma Contract.</p> | <p>The State confirms</p> |
| Page 16 (e.1) | <p>42</p> <p>How many TAC meetings are there per year at which attendance may be required?</p> | <p>2 meetings per year.</p> |
| Section A.4, Page 18-19 (j) Various Meeting s | <p>43</p> <p>Please confirm that the administration vendor does not have responsibility for logistics or expenses related to TAC meetings.</p> | <p>The State confirms</p> |
| Section A.4, Page 18-19 (j) Various Meeting s | <p>44</p> <p>Introductory Meetings: Please provide a sample schedule for the location and dates of the 12 location meetings. Over how many weeks/days do the 12 meetings occur?</p> | <p>Sample dates: September 10-13, September 16-19, September 23-26</p> <p>Sample locations: Nashville, Jackson, Chattanooga, Knoxville, Memphis, Martin, Cookeville, Johnson City (potentially 2 meetings per location in larger metropolitan</p> |

| RFP SECTION N and PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|--|---|--|
| | | areas) The 12 meetings would occur over 12 days and could be spread over 3-4 weeks. |
| Section A.4, Page 18-19 (j) Various Meetings | 45 Regional Assessment Meetings: Please provide a sample schedule for the location and dates of the 6 location meetings that occur fall and spring. Over how many weeks/days do the 6 meetings occur? | Sample dates: September 30-October 4, October 7 Sample locations: Nashville, Chattanooga, Knoxville, Memphis, Martin, Johnson City The 6 meetings would occur over 6 business days, over a period of 1 week and 1 day. |
| Section A.4, Page 18-19 (j) Various Meetings | 46 Assessment Logistics Advisory Meeting: How many of the 15 attendees are district educators versus TDOE staff and will need hotel lodging? | 12 attendees are district educators and will need hotel lodgings. |
| Section A.4, Page 18-19 (j) Various Meetings | 47 Range finding: Please clarify if each attendee requires both substitute reimbursement and stipend. If each receives one or the other but not both, can you provide an estimate of the percentage of attendees that would receive substitute reimbursement or stipend? | Majority (70%) would receive stipend only. Attendees do not receive both. |
| Page 19 | 48 Who is the audience for the additional training meetings to introduce the CBT testing platform? Can these meetings be done virtually? What is the estimated number of total attendees? | Introductory meetings should be aimed at testing coordinators and technology directors, as well as potentially other district-level staff. Meetings should be done in person. Per the table in A.4.(j) of the pro forma contract, approximately 195 attendees per meeting. |
| Page 24-25 (f. Standard Setting) | 49 TAC or professional evaluators at Standard Settings: Would these attendees be in addition to the 10 attendees per assessment identified in the meeting table? How many evaluators should bidders budget for, and what is the stipend amount for these TAC or professional evaluators? | These attendees would be in addition to the 10 attendees per assessment. The vendor should not budget for external evaluators or TAC members. |
| RFP Attachment 6.2 – Section B.17 | 50 Please define a completed project. Would a completed assessment year/cycle qualify? Could an individual client provide a reference about a completed assessment contract year [a completed project] in addition to a | A completed assessment year/cycle would qualify as completed projects. Clients could provide references for |

| RFP SECTION N and PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>reference about the current assessment contract year?</p> <p>Alternately, could Respondents provide more than three current contract references in lieu of completed project references as long as they total five contracts from at least three individuals?</p> | <p>both completed and current contract years.</p> |
| <p>Pro Forma Contract , Section A.7.f, pg. 25</p> | <p>51</p> <p>Will staff from the Test Development Contractor attend and support facilitation of standard setting meetings? If so, is the Administration contractor responsible for any travel or related expenses for their participation?</p> | <p>The test development contractor will be in attendance at the standard setting meetings, but the administration contractor, who is responsible for psychometric services, will be responsible for facilitation. The administration contractor is not responsible for travel or expenses related to the test development contractor's participation.</p> |
| <p>Pro Forma Contract A.8.b.(2)</p> | <p>52</p> <p>Should Respondents include paper practice tests in their budget? Or will practice tests be available only for computer-based testing?</p> | <p>Respondents should not include paper practice tests in their budget. The print-ready version of these is developed by the development vendor and posted online (not printed for districts).</p> |
| <p>Page 17 (i. Technic al Support Services)</p> | <p>53</p> <p>Please provide the number of contacts for Technical Support Services for the period July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018 by month. If possible, please provide the breakdown by chat, phone, and email.</p> | <p>See attached table "TCAP Customer Support July 2017- June 2018".</p> |
| <p>Attachm ent 6.3.A Cost Proposal Workbo ok, section A.4, row 14</p> | <p>54</p> <p>Line 14 requests the price for Technical Support Services as per administration. However, services are provided year-round and factors that influence Technical Support Services, particularly call volume, likely vary between fall and spring administrations. Would TDOE consider this line as per year rather than per administration?</p> | <p>Yes, the TDOE has updated the cost workbook to reflect this requested revision.</p> |
| <p>Field Test / Range-f inding</p> | <p>55</p> <p>Regarding the 2019 Spring Field Test items, will the current vendor hand off scored or unscored student responses to the new vendor? If they were scored, have they also been through range-finding?</p> | <p>The current vendor will hand off scored student responses to the new vendor. Assuming the second question references specifically essay items, items intended for use on the 2019-</p> |

| RFP SECTION N and PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|---|--|--|
| | | 20 assessments will be preliminarily scored but will not have gone through range-finding. |
| Pro Forma Contract , A.12.a, pg. 43 | 56 Please identify, by grade and content area, the number of operational and field test items to be hand scored. | See attached table, "Item Types for TN Assessments, 2018-19". |
| RFP Attachment B, A.7.c | 57 By what date does the state require data from the scoring of the Field Test items? | June 15 |
| Pro Forma Contract , pgs. 18 – 19 | 58 The table of meetings in the Pro Forma Contract states that there will be "10 standard setting panelists per test." Does this mean per grade level per test? | The tests are specific to grade level. For example, grade 3 ELA test is considered 1 test, while the grade 4 ELA test is considered a separate test. |
| Pro Forma Contract , pg. 21 | 59 The Pro Forma Contract states that the contractor will provide "detailed, standardized, quality control procedures". Are these to be described in the proposal or in proposal appendices? If so, does TDOE wish to have procedures for all functional tasks? | Either location is acceptable. Yes, the TDOE wishes to have procedures for all functional tasks. |
| Pro Forma Contract , pg. 47 | 60 The Pro Forma Contract states, "Assessment Reports shall be separately designed and developed for each Assessment for each Test Year." Does this mean there will be no combined reports? | Reports are separate by test, with the exception of labels, which are combined across tests. |
| Cost Proposal Worksheet | 61 Should vendors add a line item for packaging and distribution costs in section A8 Assessment Materials? | If the vendor chooses to cost this out separately rather than accounting for this in the cost of the materials, that is acceptable. |
| Mandatory Requirements, A.12, pg. 21 | 62 For the raw scores being reported, does the single raw score include the score points for both machine-scored (i.e., selected response) and human-scored (i.e., constructed-response) items? | Yes. |
| | 63 Our expectation is that districts will need the opportunity to review and modify student information, including student demographics and teacher assignments, during the reporting cycle. When in the sequence of events does this activity usually take place? | For the 2018-19 year, student demographics and teacher information is being pulled and sent to the vendor on April 8. The State has internal processes for this that do not involve the administration vendor. |
| Pro Forma | 64 Please identify, for each assessment, the number of students that test online and on | Attachment A contains a table, |

| RFP SECTION N and PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Contract , A.3.g | paper throughout a testing window. | TCAP Assessment Administration Context that outlines this information. Mode of administration is determined by assessment, so computer-based tests are computer-based for all students with the exception of students requiring a paper-based accommodation. |
| | 65 Items contained within the sample package, Sample QTI Packages TN.zip, do not contain stylesheet references and accompanying stylesheet(s), though the item markup contains style class references. Can a sample QTI package be generated which contains the stylesheet(s) and item stylesheet references? If not, would it be possible to receive the stylesheet(s) separately? | See attached style guides for text as well as graphics for the TCAP assessments. Vendors should use their own cascading style sheets and adhere to the guidelines provided in the attached documents for TN program-specific item formatting requirements. |

3. Delete RFP # 33111-03819, in its entirety, and replace it with RFP # 33111-03819, Release # 2, attached to this amendment. Revisions of the original RFP document are emphasized within the new release. Any sentence or paragraph containing revised or new text is highlighted.

4. Delete RFP section 3.3.1 in its entirety and insert the following in its place (any sentence or paragraph containing revised or new text is highlighted):

3.3.1 A response must not include alternate contract terms and conditions, except as otherwise permitted by the RFP. If a response contains such terms and conditions the State, at its sole discretion, may determine the response to be a non-responsive counteroffer and reject it.

5. Add the following as RFP section 5.3.4 and renumber any subsequent sections as necessary:

5.3.4 Subject to agreement on the exceptions permitted by RFP Attachment 6.2 – B.19., the Respondent identified as offering the apparent best-evaluated response must sign a contract drawn by the State pursuant to this RFP. The Contract shall be substantially the same as the RFP Attachment 6.6., *Pro Forma* Contract except as modified by any mutually agreed to exceptions permitted by RFP Attachment 6.2 – B.19. The Respondent must sign the Contract by the Contractor Signature Deadline detailed in the RFP Section 2, Schedule of Events. If the Respondent fails to provide the signed Contract by this deadline, the State may determine that the Respondent is non-responsive to this RFP and reject the response.

Add the following as RFP Attachment 6.2.-Section B. and renumber any subsequent sections as necessary:

| | | | |
|--|--------------|---|--|
| | B.19. | The Respondents are permitted to submit, as part of their Response, a "redline" of RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma Contract</i> , that tracks the Respondents' request for alternative or supplemental contract language. The redline changes that are allowed by this provision shall not include any exceptions or changes that (1) contradict any applicable state or federal law; (2) a mandatory requirement identified in RFP Attachment 6.2. – Section A; or (3) alter any deadlines in the Schedule of Events. | |
|--|--------------|---|--|

6. **RFP Amendment Effective Date.** The revisions set forth herein shall be effective upon release. All other terms and conditions of this RFP not expressly amended herein shall remain in full force and effect.